Review of: "A Review of the Processes and Procedures of Road Traffic Accident Mortality Data Collection in Zambia"

S. M.Sohel Mahmud[1]

1 Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology

The article presents a review of RTC mortality data collection processes and procedures in Zambia with a view to identifying key challenges, opportunities, and the way forward. The topic is contemporary and crucial, particularly for LMICs like Zambia. Therefore, the study has research value, but the paper has some serious flaws.

1. The first three paragraphs describe the magnitude and burden of RTC. The focus area of the paper started from the 4th paragraph without any linking with the previous description. Better summarize the unfocused area and make a connection with the data collection-related description, which is the main focus area of the paper, as a justification of previous descriptions.

2. The paper mainly discusses the overall data collection process qualitatively. Criteria-based analysis, quantitative evaluation, and performance matrix are missing.

3. Some other specific comments are below:

- The study background, rationale of the study, and implications are pointed out clearly.

- Literature Review (LR) should focus on data-related literature. 1st paragraph is just a repetition of the burden of the RTC. LR mainly focused on the study related to underreporting problems and the consequences of underreporting (Paragraphs 2 to 6). Rather, it should focus on the Processes and Procedures of Road Traffic Accident Mortality Data Collection, which is the main focus of the study (only 8th para), and identify the gaps.

- Method: "To evaluate the effectiveness of the data collection process, the business process map was assessed against a performance matrix consisting of four criteria: fit for purpose, satisfaction of business requirements, process delays and interruptions, and time and resource efficiency". Apparently, the methodology is robust but did not find any reference in the text. Please give some references, particularly for the "business process," or justification. Say, what do you mean by "fit for purpose," and how did you evaluate it? Where is the performance matrix?

- Findings and discussions are very much generic. Findings should be based on the four criteria, and discussion should align with these issues. Some quantitative analysis is highly expected, say, process delay time at different stages, level of time, resource efficiency, etc.

- Conclusion: "This study analysed the level of underreporting of RTC data by comparing data from the police, hospitals, and the CRVS system". Very confusing claim. I did not find any quantitative figures or comparative analysis, say, table, except for some discussion with some percent. Please explain.

- Recommendations: "Establish a multidisciplinary road crash data analysis and reporting team": Police are officially

responsible for RTC records. Will it not create a conflicting situation? Normally, police have a wider network all over the country. There are some judicial issues regarding RTC. How will the team deal with those issues?

- "Develop policies to enhance collaboration between the police and CRVS". Very intangible term. Will need another research. Better should be very specific about the policy requirements i.e., what type of policy?